

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 9, 10, 12-14, 18-21, 23, 24, 26-28, 41, 42, 45-47, 49-53, 56 and 58-61 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

On top of page 3, the outstanding Office Action asserts that claims 9-10, 12-28, 41-42, 45-53 and 56-61 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Tanabe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,586) and further in view of Japanese Utility Model No. 258847, Ogawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,076), and further in view of JP 2001 116908 (Toppan Printing Co. Ltd.)

On June 28, 2007, Applicants filed a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and the fee according to 37 C.F.R. 1.17(i), for correction of inventorship (as a consequence of the cancelled claims) by the deletion of Mr. Toshiki Toda and Mr. Akira Nagano, thereby leaving Mr. Susumu Takahashi as sole inventor.

The outstanding Office Action on page 2 states that the change of inventorship is not entered because the assignee's consent was not included. Applicant respectfully submit that according to MPEP 201.03, written consent of the assignee is not required for requests filed under 37 C.F.R. §1.48(b), applicable when due to prosecution fewer than all currently named inventors are the actual inventors of the remaining claims. Applicants respectfully request the petition for change of inventorship to be entered.

Thus, based on the previously filed petition for change of inventorship, reference JP 2001/116908 by Takahashi is not a prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 because its date is less than 1 year prior to filing the current application and the reference has the same author as to the inventor of this application. Applicants also wish to emphasize that European patent law does not have the same approach to prior art as the U.S. Patent Law. For example, the reference to "inventive step" in the response to arguments is not appropriate.

Therefore, independent claims 9, 20, 41, 52 and 61, patentably distinguish over Tanabe, Landis and Ogawa which fail to teach or suggest, for example as recited in claim 9, "a light reflecting optical film which is arranged on a rear surface of the liquid crystal display layer, on substantially identical curved lines having a sector of a circle shape, the curved lines being separated at regular intervals, each interval having a horizontal component and a vertical component."

Dependent claims 10, 12-14, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26-28, 42, 45-47, 49-51, 53, 56, and 58-60 are also patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

Jan. 15, 2008

By:

L. Todor

Luminita A. Todor

Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501